

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-22 are pending. Since no claims are added, amended or canceled, no listing of claims is required under 37 CFR 1.121.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 1-16 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Takatsu (US 6,535,702) in view of Yajima (US 6,862,104). Claim 17 is rejected as obvious over Takatsu in view of Yajima and Sato (US 6,892,811). In response, applicant traverses the rejections.

Claims 1, 2, 7-11 and 22

As discussed in its previous response, claim 1 recites that contents of jobs not yet executed by the facsimile control section are:

...displayed one by one on the display unit in order each time a user presses the button on the input unit...

Independent claim 7 similarly recites that contents of jobs not yet executed by the job execution section are displayed one by one on the display section in order each time a user presses the button on the input unit. Thus, as shown for example in applicant's FIGS. 6(A)-(D) and 7(A)-(D), and described for example at page 24, line 7 to page 26, line 19, facsimile job information display screens are displayed one-by-one on screen 31 each time a user presses buttons 52R and 52L.

The Action acknowledges that Takatsu lacks disclosure of this feature, but asserts that it would be obvious in view of Yajima. Applicant disagrees. FIG. 2 of Yajima, cited by the Action, shows a display portion 2 of a control panel 1 of an information transmitting apparatus. Here, a first job having the status "SENDING" and second and third jobs having the status "WAITING" are numbered 1, 2 and 3 and are simultaneously displayed on one screen. See Yajima, col. 5, lines 4-9. Claims 1 and 7, by contrast, require that jobs not yet executed are displayed

one by one in order each time a user presses a button on the input unit. Yajima only discloses the simultaneous display of all jobs and does not disclose or suggest that jobs are displayed one by one in response to user button presses.

Since Takatsu and Yajima do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 7, claims 1 and 7 and claims 2, 8-11 and 22 dependent thereon are not obvious over Takatsu in view of Yajima.

Claims 3-6

Independent claim 3 recites that contents of incomplete jobs are displayed on the display unit one by one in the order of the read job and the facsimile transmission job, and that when facsimile transmission jobs are present in response to a user input, the contents of the facsimile transmission jobs are displayed in inverse order of management start time of each facsimile transmission job. Independent claim 5 similarly recites that contents of incomplete jobs are displayed on the display unit one by one in the order of the read job, the facsimile transmission job, the print job and the facsimile reception job in response to a user input, and that when facsimile transmission jobs are present, the contents of the facsimile transmission jobs are displayed in inverse order of management start time of each facsimile transmission job.

Since the order of management start time would be from the first (oldest) job to the last (newest) job, the inverse order of management start time is from the last (newest) to the first (oldest) job. Display of facsimile transmission jobs in such order provides the advantages described at page 34, lines 15-21 of applicant's specification. In particular, since a user wishes to check a work for errors just after the work is complete, display of the newest job first simplifies and speeds this operation.

The Action acknowledges that Takatsu lacks disclosure of this feature, but asserts that it would be obvious in view of Yajima. Applicant disagrees. Yajima's FIG. 2 clearly shows that jobs 1-3 are displayed in order of management start time (i.e. job 1 started first at 14:35; job 2 started second at 14:37; and job 3 started third

at 14:38). The Action acknowledges that Yajima discloses this order of oldest job to newest job, but asserts that this is an inverse order. For the reasons discussed above, applicant disagrees. Again, since the order of management start time is clearly from the first (oldest) job to the last (newest) job, the inverse order of management start time as claimed by applicant must be from the last (newest) to the first (oldest) job. Yajima contains no such disclosure.

Since Takatsu and Yajima do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 3 and 5 claims 3 and 5 and claims 4 and 6 dependent thereon are not obvious over Takatsu in view of Yajima.

Claims 12-21

The invention of independent claims 12 and 18 addresses the problem of cancellation of a job when a plurality of jobs are being executed in parallel. In the prior art, a user wishing to cancel a job from a plurality of jobs is required to perform at least three types of operations (applicant's specification, page 3, lines 14-20).

Applicant solves this problem. As recited in claims 12 and 18, when a button on an input unit is pressed to cancel a job from a plurality of jobs executed in parallel, the job to be canceled is selected by way of a predetermined algorithm from the running or waiting jobs in the job execution section. For example, as described at page 33, line 24 to page 34, line 12 of applicant's specification, the job to be canceled may be selected in a ranking order of the user's most likely desire to cancel. The cancellation instruction acceptance section then executes instruction await input processing on the selected job. That is, the facsimile machine awaits an input operation as to whether the selected job should be canceled. Thus, the user does not need to display the list of all parallel jobs in order to select and cancel one of them.

The Action acknowledges that Takatsu fails to disclose this feature, but asserts that it would be obvious in view of Yajima's mere disclosure in FIG. 2 of a "STOP/DELETE" button . Applicant disagrees. Yajima contains no disclosure or

suggestion that a job would be canceled in any manner other than the ordinary, known manner, i.e., when the "STOP/DELETE" button of FIG. 2 is pressed, the particular one of jobs 1-3 selected by the user would be canceled. In particular, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Yajima that when the STOP/DELETE button is pressed, that one job of the plurality of jobs is selected by a predetermined algorithm, and that instruction input await processing is then executed wherein the selected job to be canceled is displayed and further user input is awaited.

Sato is cited against claim 17 for its alleged relevance to canceling a job without making an inquiry to a user as to whether the job should be canceled. In particular, Sato states at col. 8, lines 36-37 that a job could be canceled due to an error in the apparatus without intervening the user. However, Sato still fails to remedy the deficiency of Takatsu and Yajima to disclose or suggest selecting a job to be canceled from a plurality of parallel jobs using a predetermined algorithm.

Since Takatsu, Yajima and Sato do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 12 and 18, claims 12 and 18 and claims 13-17 and 19-21 dependent thereon are not obvious over Takatsu in view of Yajima and/or Sato.

For these reasons, the rejections of claims 1-22 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion


This application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after consideration and entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Appl. No. 10/810,341
Reply dated September 15, 2008
Reply to Office Action of June 13, 2008

Atty. Ref. 88518.0002
Customer No. 26021

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: September 15, 2008

By: 
Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601